



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in *du*, p. 123, l. 664, or in a number of cases of *m* on p. 125. If this is not intention, the publishers may be held accountable for it.

In some other matters the editor cannot be absolved from blame. Thus the choice of fonts is doubtless his own, and in some cases it leads to confusion. So in *Graf Rudolf* and *Wigamur* uncertain letters and words are printed in italics; also all the comments in the footnotes are printed in italics. The footnote to 1676f. reads as follows: "*Ausser min. So wolde hat noch ein Wort im Ausmass von ich etwa Platz: Gerne wolte?*" Precedent favors the use of italics; but clearness is the first requisite, and it would have been better to print the conjectural letters in black type, or in some special font.

Many of the mss. were freshly collated by the editor for this book, and in frequent instances his reading differs from that of other scholars. In these cases he prints the doubtful word in the footnotes, with an exclamation point following, to indicate that he is aware of the difference, and is sure of his reading. The resulting excessive use of the exclamation, as in No. 3 and No. 7, becomes very wearying, and one wonders why the same result could not have been achieved by the mere reprint of the word in the note, or by the use of *sic*, which occasionally is employed. One feels that this half controversial device is not quite in place in a book for beginners.

To the editor's account must also be laid a certain inconsistency in typographical matters. After announcing an accurate reprint of the mss., and carrying out the reproduction in many cases with really exemplary fidelity, he alters them in other respects. For example, he remarks in his notes to No. 3: "The ms. writes the verses continuously and separates them by rhyme-points. I print in lines and punctuate after Hoffmann." In a footnote on the following page he says: "Roediger's numerous suggestions as to the punctuation are included in the reprint." The two statements evidently conflict; but aside from that, why should the orthography be retained, even to the forms of the letters, and the peculiar punctuation of the ms. discarded?

After a careful survey of the book, I am strongly of the conviction that the attempt to reproduce the mss. by means of ordinary types is nearly futile. It breaks down always when especial difficulties arise; and a single genuine ms. page, closely studied, should do more to inform the student of the peculiarities and difficulties of the medieval mss. than a hundred printed pages. If the texts had been printed in ordinary type, and a few facsimile plates inserted, the cost of the latter would perhaps have been covered by the saving on the type-setting, and the book have been made immensely more valuable to the student.

At the same time, these are trivial defects which do not seriously impair the solid merit of the book. Teachers everywhere will welcome this aid to their seminary exercises, and indeed it contains a great amount of material not readily accessible. It should at once take its place beside Braune's *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch* as a standard work.

B. Q. MORGAN.

University of Wisconsin.

HONORÉ DE BALZAC, *Gobseck et Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, edited with introduction, notes, and index by R. T. HOLBROOK. New York: Oxford University Press, 1913. xxv + 197 pp.

The object of this review is less to criticize than to call attention to a most excellent piece of editing, one that might in many respects serve as a model to future makers of language text-books. The publishers as well as the editor deserve praise for the splendid way in which they have done their share. Paper, print, and binding are all that could be asked, and if the series of which Professor Weeks is the general editor keeps up the high standard set by the first two numbers, we may safely predict a genuine success for it.

What gives the work of Professor Holbrook an especially high value is the thoroughness

with which he has treated the syntactical part of his text. Most editors confine their labors to the elucidation of the most obvious difficulties. These have not been slighted in the work under discussion, but have been handled with the fulness they deserve, thus saving the reader needless researches. Most of the notes have a genuine pedagogical value in that they constantly appeal to the student's reasoning faculties and satisfy his natural desire to know the why and wherefore. Numerous cross-references stimulate and help him to test his knowledge, to compare, and to deduce the unknown from the known. To be more specific, the verbal constructions have been treated with a completeness not to be found in any edition known to me, and constant reference is made to works containing the latest and best that has been published on that subject. The use of the subjunctive, of imperfect, past definite and past indefinite, so often slighted by instructors because too often badly understood and difficult, have been fearlessly and competently tackled wherever they occur. Care is also taken to insist upon an accurate rendering into English, wherever the text might tempt students to be satisfied with such a slipshod translation as is common in colleges and high schools, where French, German, Latin, and Greek are often the innocent causes of corrupt English. Frequent comparisons between French constructions or shades of meaning and their English equivalents help the reader to appreciate the resources and shortcomings of both languages, a method which deepens the learner's insight into his own and the foreign tongue, develops his feeling for them, and spurs him on to further study in the field of linguistics. Thus understood and practised, the study of modern languages will become truly scientific and humanistic.

The only criticism one may feel inclined to make has to do with the choice of at least the first of the two stories here edited. *Gobseck*, if in a few respects quite characteristic of Balzac's manner, is by no means to be reckoned among his best productions either from the point of view of style or as a character sketch. It contains, it is true, admirable pages, such as those which describe the hero's last hours.

Still, this usurer is by no means convincing; and, as for the plot, there is none. Most of the subsidiary characters are false to nature, or uninteresting. The most one can say is that Balzac has in this story given full rein to his propensity for semi-shady business transactions and legal trickery, but they may be met with in half a dozen better stories from his pen.

Then again, one may question the wisdom of so high-pitched a commentary applied to a linguistically easy work. Is not the standard of the former too high for students "who have been carefully trained in simpler French during one year at least"? And if not, it might have been advisable to choose a work more difficult in character and of a higher esthetic value; in other words, one worthy of such admirable efforts. The foregoing remarks do not apply to the second story, *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, one of Balzac's best shorter works. Two-thirds at least of it are excellent. The last third is open to criticism as having hardly any connection with the plot and as being full of obscure allegory. Whatever one may think of the stories, there can be no doubt that the study of the notes will constitute a most salutary tonic to students of French, and a most wholesome stimulant to teachers using the book. Some will no doubt call these notes unduly full: 68 pages of small print for 115 of large—almost as much commentary as text. To be sure, the editor remarks in his preface that it will be an easy matter to advise the students "what to study and what to omit," which, of course, disarms the critic.

Personally I do not like the practice, followed in both introduction and commentary, of quoting in French, from critics, biographers, or the author himself, lengthy passages which are often more difficult than the story in hand. If they are intended as a help to the students, there is every reason to add explanations of the linguistic difficulties occurring in the passages. But a simpler way and one which would save time is to give such quotations in English.

The following remarks are offered in connection with the notes.

P. 2, *collège*; p. 29, l. 10, *complètement*; p. 35, l. 23, and again in index, *privilège*. Such

words, generally spelled with *é* in Balzac's day, are now written with *è*.—P. 2, *De viris*. Up to about thirty years ago it was the common practice in French schools (still kept up in some clerical schools to-day) to begin the study of Latin not with Phaedrus, but with Lhomond's *Epitome historiarum sacrarum*.—P. 3, l. 12. Mme. de Grandlieu's speech can hardly be called "high-falutin." She is an aristocrat and is speaking to her daughter, a young lady who is yet under training for a station in high-life. Aristocrats used to address their children with *vous*, which Mme. de G. uses here, and which implies considerable formality in the relations. I should have preferred a note on *tenir une conduite* and *avoir une conduite* used in the same sentence.—P. 6, l. 1, *il ne profitait pas de cette faveur comme aurait pu en profiter un homme ambitieux*. The alleged reason for the inversion in the latter half of the sentence seems to me far-fetched, or if that be the historical or logical reason, I doubt that Balzac ever thought of it. The obvious reason is that he wished to avoid the repetition of the verb *profiter* in a stressed position, and thus lighten the sentence.—P. 6, ll. 16–17. Since nothing is said about the location of the Faubourg St. Germain (p. 5, l. 2) near one of the oldest churches in Paris (St. Germain des Prés on the left bank of the Seine) it is hardly relevant to state that the Rue de la Chaussée d'Antin is near the Opéra, unless one adds that about 1830 it was the important wholesale business quarter of Paris. A dandy from the world of trade would be happy to be admitted to the inner circles of the noble faubourg.—P. 8, l. 13. Is it advisable to call *vous l'eussiez comparé* subjunctive? Historically it is, but in reality it is now a variant form of the past conditional.—P. 17, l. 1. The editor takes *mécanique anglaise* to mean something like an automaton, thereby implying on the part of Balzac an intended "slur at what he supposed to be a representative English trait." If such were the case, B. would probably have used *automate anglais*. I think he means what he says, a mechanical device, a kind of *mouvement d'horlogerie* repeating the same movements with monotonous regularity. Nowadays he

might have used *mécanique américaine*.—P. 22, ll. 19–20, *Si le roi me devait, madame, et qu'il ne me payât pas*. The editor rightly and repeatedly calls attention to the fact that preterites and impf. subjunctives are avoided in "every-day French," but is too emphatic and too sweeping in his proscription of the hated tenses. Cultured Frenchmen have no such horror of them. It may be asserted that the endings *-sse*, *-ssions*, *-ssiez* are shunned and sound pedantic. But the third person singular, *-ât*, *-ût*, *-ît*, is under no such harsh ban. Careful speakers still use it. As for the past definite, it can still be very properly employed in a sustained narrative like Derville's. It all depends on the milieu one frequents. Expressions like *fût-il roi de Prusse, fussiez-vous dix fois plus riche*, etc., may be heard daily. The forms are on the wane and will doubtless disappear, but it is an exaggeration to say that they are gone and no longer to be used in conversation.

P. 29, l. 16, *un verre d'eau sucrée*. This rather lengthy note fails to point out that the French have long known the refreshing and tonic effect of sugar. The suggestion has been made, and, I think, carried out, to provide soldiers with lump-sugar when on long marches. It may be remarked that the American student will hardly understand the editor's use of 'loaf' in the sense 'lump.'—P. 30, l. 28, *à le venir voir*. This construction is by no means so common as the note would have us believe. *Venir le voir, aller le chercher*, etc., are by far more current to-day in the mouth of the people.—P. 34, l. 20, *tôper*, in most dictionaries written without accent. It would also be well to indicate, what a majority of French-English dictionaries fail to do, that the word means to strike in the hand (rather than to shake hands) and that in provincial cattle or horse markets or in private deals between farmers, such a slap in the hand closes a bargain, and, if performed in the presence of witnesses, is as binding as a signed and sealed contract.—P. 37, l. 6. *Ne faites pas de folies* means 'don't be extravagant' rather than 'do nothing rash.' Gobseck gives this piece of advice because of the readiness with which Derville offers to treat with champagne and partridges. Besides, Gobseck

specifies the *folies* immediately afterward: *Ne prenez pas grand train de maison*, etc.—P. 39, l. 7, *plus occupé de bien digérer*: a note should call attention to this *occupé de*, which means ‘concerned with,’ and not ‘busy with.’ A word might also have been devoted to the first *de* of p. 40, l. 3, *vous diriez d’un champ de bataille*.—P. 41, 15. The unfortunate use of *échec* for *brèche* is not noted; *échec* means ‘reverse,’ ‘setback’; one can suffer an *échec*, but *on ne se le fait pas*.—P. 42, 22, *de cabriolet*. Mr. Holbrook, who so carefully notes all such constructions, seems to have overlooked this omission of the article. The same applies to 44, 22.—P. 43, 9, *Mon Gobseck*; in English ‘your Gobseck.’—P. 43, l. 24. *Fashionable*, used as a noun is never replaced in modern French by *chic* but by *gommeux*, *dandy*, *petit maître*, *élégant*, etc., and in Balzac’s day frequently by *mirliflore*. (See Eugénie Grandet, *passim*).—P. 44, ll. 7–10, *mais vous êtes aussi des éponges*. The editor interprets: *mais vous aussi, vous êtes des éponges*, which is of course correct. But he then refers to notes on p. 16, l. 28: *Voyons l’existence de plus haut qu’ils ne la voient*, and 18, 7: *et se donneraient en paiement plutôt que de ne pas payer*. About the latter he says: “Here again Balzac idiomatically, but illogically, uses the unstressed pronoun, though a special emphasis of the *se* is obviously required.” The form of this statement is misleading, as I was able to observe with my students: Modern French does not tolerate stress on *je*, *tu*, *il*, *me*, *te*, *se*, *le*. The case in 44, 7 is not identical. *Vous* may, and as a matter of fact, does have a stress, intensified by the adjunction of *aussi*, which is also stressed. Should the stress be placed on the last word of the clause (*éponges*) as it is in 16, 28, and 18, 7, the meaning would then be quite different, and would be: “You must admit that you are sponges.” Cf. *Vous êtes aussi par trop stupide*, where *aussi* has about the same meaning as German *doch*.

P. 51, ll. 16–17, *vous êtes bien difficile à confesser, ma belle dame*. Attention should be called to Gobseck’s joke (‘you are hard to bring to terms’) and to his coarse and improbable familiarity (*ma belle dame*).—P. 55, ll. 22–23,

faire le commerce. What authority is there for the statement that this implies “crafty dealing”? The *Dict. Gén.* has: “Faire du commerce, vendre, échanger sans être dans le commerce.” *Faire le commerce* has the same meaning.—P. 58, l. 15. *Ça m’a l’air for cet homme m’a l’air* deserved a brief note.—P. 61, l. 20, *ne fussent-ils que*. Cf. above my remark about p. 22, ll. 19–20. The same applies here; also to 77, 3, *aimât*, and 84, 25–26, *comme eût fait*, forms which though obsolescent are still much alive.—P. 79, l. 16. I doubt whether many students will be able to solve the riddle propounded here. What is there in common between *par le désespoir* and *par bonheur* or *par hasard*? Would it not have been more to the point to ask for the differences between *échevelée par le désespoir* and *elle s’est tuée par désespoir* or *de désespoir*; *il l’a fait par vanité* and *il a été vaincu par la vanité*; *il est mort de maladie*, *il était miné par la maladie*, *il était atteint d’une maladie grave*? *Par in par le désespoir* means simply ‘because of’ and there is no need to personify ‘despair.’—P. 84, l. 4, *par Haïti*. The article is not omitted “because Haïti is a party to a suit—that is, Haïti personified,” but merely because Haïti, like various other names of island-countries, never takes the article.—P. 85, l. 5, *vieille connaissance à moi*. To this H. remarks: “In Old French one might say *une mienne*—, *un mien*—, etc.” We might add that this was rarely used before an adjective, and also that expressions like *un mien ami*, *un tien parent*, *une mienne cousine* are still in use. (Cf. Haase, § 17 E.)—P. 86, l. 25, *Lascar*. In the mouth of the people this epithet means hardly more than *le vieux malin*, *le vieux lapin*, ‘the old codger,’ ‘the old guy.’—P. 97, l. 11, “*qualités*, i. e., *bonnes qualités*.” The wording is unfortunate: since *qualités* are always good, *bonnes* is “de trop.”—P. 103, l. 17. *Gâvres* is an unimportant *seigneurie* outside the walls of Ghent.—P. 109, ll. 21–22, and p. 93, l. 16. While Belgium as a separate kingdom dates only from 1831, it would have been well, in connection with these notes, to remark for the student the long-established application of the name to the region of the South Netherlands.—P. 114, ll.

10-11, *En criant de sa voix, dont*. . . This *sa* is called illogical and *d'une voix* is preferred because "the hag could not have cried with any voice save her own." The construction, illogical though it may seem, is common enough. Cf. *il cria de sa voix de stentor; il me regarda de ses yeux de flamme*, and thence: *de ses yeux qui lançaient des flammes*.—P. 117, l. 6. There seems no good reason for supposing that in mentioning Messalina, Balzac had in mind Lucretia Borgia. The word *cirque* immediately following sufficiently indicates the period of history he had in mind.¹

J. L. BORGERHOFF.

Western Reserve University.

Modern Italian Literature, by LACY COLLISON-MORLEY. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1912. 8vo. viii + 356 pp.

Mr. Collison-Morley's book is the first in English to treat specifically of Italian literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. His single hope for the work, according to the modest preface, is that it may increase the number of English readers of the modern Italian writers. That hope will doubtless be richly fulfilled. Mr. Collison-Morley has in exceptional measure the gift of stimulating the desire for first-hand reading of his authors. He is in general free from exaggeration—indeed, his praise is in most cases severely limited—yet he conveys most successfully his impressions of interest and of real value. His choice of illustrative selections is admirable, and his translations are good. Often, instead of venturing critical estimates of his own, he quotes the masters of modern Italian criticism, De Sanctis and Carucci.

But his book is by no means for the general reader only. It is based on careful reading of the standard histories and larger monographs,

and of the most important of the works discussed. It is in general accurate, and it is comprehensive and well-proportioned. The original criticism, though slight in amount, is excellent in many instances. The frequent references to the relations of Italian and English writers are especially commendable. The book therefore merits scholarly attention, and becomes the normal text-book for use in courses on Modern Italian Literature.

Unfortunately, though accurate in general, the book is inaccurate in many details,—so inaccurate that it can hardly be read with satisfaction or used to advantage as a text-book unless its many errata are first corrected. With a view to such correction, I submit lists of the errors I have noted. For brevity's sake, I have quoted the defective words or phrases without context.

Page 1, line 1: for poets read poets of the Renaissance.—9, 8: first: best [a few mock-heroic poems were written in the 16th century].—17, 19f: Youth in its prime was strolling: Youth's most select were strolling.—28, 3: *delete* Hence the delay in its production [the delay was due to the death of Charles VI, for whose birthday it had been written].—34, 10: birthplace: home [Florence was the birthplace of the opera].—38, 9: and to realize: and one of the first to realize [Dante is perfectly clear on this point].—53, 12f: and the variations of these four original masks: and the other masks [there is no basis for speaking of any set of masks as 'the original four'].—53, 20: *delete* like Stendhal [the sentence as it stands implies that Stendhal lived before Goldoni].—58, 25f: relegated the masks of Brighella and Arlecchino to the subordinate position of servants: reduced the importance of the masks [Brighella and Harlequin were servants even in the earliest *Commedia dell'arte*].—59, 23ff: *delete* He had no high ideals or ruling passions. Vice and even crime amused him instead of rousing his indignation, for he was kindly and tolerant of all men [this is quite untrue, except for the words 'he was kindly'].—59, 30 and 60, 17: del: dell'.—61, 6: three: four.—61, 26 and 63, 19: Gasparo: Gaspere.—65, n: was the inventor of: played [Truffaldino antedates Sacchi].—66, 24ff: *delete* He was no satirist . . . wish to reform it [quite untrue].—69, 4: del: dell'.—70, 10f: *delete* as we gather from the "Famiglia del antiquario" [that play contains no im-

¹ Misprints. Read *les*, 7, 7; *nous les avons entendus dire*, note to 7, 19-20; *Portenduère*, 195.